DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 276 480 JC 870 005

AUTHOR Quanty, Michael B.
TITLE Staff Perception Survey.
INSTITUTION Thomas Nelson Community Coll., Hampton, VA. Office of Institutional Research.
PUB DATE 24 Sep 86
NOTE 22p.
PUB TYPE Reports - Descriptive (141) -- Tests/Evaluation Instruments (160)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC01 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS Academic Advising; *Administrator Attitudes; Ancillary School Services; *College Environment; College Faculty; *College Instruction; College Programs; Community Colleges; *Employee Attitudes; *Faculty College Relationship; Program Evaluation; Public Relations; School Personnel; School Surveys; Self Evaluation (Groups); *Teacher Attitudes; Tenured Faculty; Two Year Colleges

ABSTRACT

A staff survey was conducted at Thomas Nelson Community College (TNCC) to examine how those employed at the college view its major instructional and student support programs. Along with demographic questions, the survey explored perceptions of the college's programs, promotional activities, and work environment, and overall impressions of TNCC. In March 1986, staff in student services, financial and administrative services, continuing education, the library, audiovisual services, and development/public information completed the survey in small groups with a researcher present to explain the instrument. Faculty and staff in instructional divisions completed the survey individually. Study findings included the following: (1) though respondents generally perceived the college's programs as above average, a substantial minority expressed reservations about recommending TNCC to family or friends; (2) when compared to ratings provided by TNCC graduates on a previous survey, staff gave lower ratings to quality of instruction and higher ratings to counseling; (3) in evaluations of promotional activities, ongoing activities such as radio and newspaper advertisements received lower ratings than special events; (4) a majority of the respondents rated their departments as friendly (74%), well organized (61%), caring (62%), open (56%), and informal (54%); (5) ratings of the college work environment, general impressions of the college, and comments regarding strengths and weaknesses pointed to a lack of communication and feelings of frustration and distrust; (6) support staff generally had a more positive impression of the college than faculty and administrators; and (7) faculty ratings of the work environment became progressively more negative with increasing years of service at the college. Tables contrasting responses of support staff, faculty, and administrators are attached. (EJV)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

O • F • F • I • C • E O • F
I • N • S • T • I • T • U • T • I • O • N • A • L
R • E • S • E • A • R • C • H

ED276480

STAFF PERCEPTION SURVEY

ABSTRACT

This report summarizes results of a survey of support staff, faculty, and administrators conducted during the Spring of 1986. Various aspects of the instructional programs and counseling were rated between average and good. Student activities received ratings that were below average. Only slightly over half of the college community would recommend TNCC without reservations.

In the area of promotional activities, special events generally were rated higher than were on-going activities. Newspaper advertisements and radio advertisements were rated below average.

People seemed to be generally satisfied with the work environment in their departments or offices but were far less satisfied with the overall college environment. Major concerns centered around lack of communication and cooperation among various groups.

IC 870 005

"PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

M. B. QUANTY

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)."

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☑ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

P.O. Box 9407
Hampton, Virginia 23670
Telephone: 804-825-2714

Michael B. Quanty

Thomas Nelson Community College

September 24, 1986

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

INTRODUCTION

As part of its marketing effort, Thomas Nelson Community College is examining perceptions held about the college among various constituencies. One of the most important of these constituencies is the college staff--faculty, support staff, and administrators. The impressions of these people are important for two reasons. First, they are intimately familiar with the institution and are thus in an excellent position to evaluate its strengths and weaknesses. Second, they are extremely important in marketing the college. If they feel good about the college, they will be in a position to promote the college to friends and neighbors. Their perceptions will reinforce and add credibility to the other promotional efforts undertaken. If, on the other hand, their attitudes are less than positive, they may be reluctant to promote the college and may in some cases refute those promotional efforts.

This survey of staff perceptions, therefore, was designed to examine how those employed at the college view its major instructional and student support programs (our products). It also looked at their evaluations of the college as a workplace. People's satisfaction with their working environment has a definite impact on the way they approach their jobs and on how they interact with the public (Norsworthy & Zabala, 1985). A third section of the survey dealt with the college's promotional efforts. Finally, respondents were asked for their overall impressions of the college and their assessments of its major strengths and weaknesses.

METHODOLOGY

The survey instrument was divided into several major sections (each on a separate page). The first section asked for demographic information (age, race, sex, employment status, years employed at TNCC, and prior employment at educational institutions). The second section was an evaluation of programs. Programs evaluated were college transfer, occupational/technical, developmental studies, community service, counseling services, and student activities. All programs were evaluated in terms of the quality, variety, and relevance of their offerings. Quality of instruction was included for the four instructional areas and academic standards was included for the three credit instructional areas (college transfer, occupational/technical, and developmental studies). All these elements were rated on a five-point scale ranging from excellent (5) to poor (1). The last question in this section asked whether respondents would recommend TNCC to friends or family. Three options were provided: "Yes, without reservation"; "Yes, but only for certain programs of study"; or "No".

The section on work environment asked respondents to rate their department or office and the college on a series of ten-point scales anchored on each end by appropriate adjectives (e.g., friendly--unfriendly). The section on promotional activities included ratings for three on-going activities (newspaper advertisements, brochures/flyers, etc., and radio advertisements) and four special events (Summer Getaway for Women, Fall Fun Fest, Christmas Crafts Fair, and College Transfer Night). Ratings were on five-point scales ranging from excellent (5) to poor (1) with a "Don't know" option. Each of the three preceding sections also included extensive space for written comments.

The last section of the survey attempted to measure respondents' general impressions of the college. The first part of this section was a series of fifteen forced choice paired comparisons in which respondents were asked to choose the adjective in each pair which was most descriptive of the college. The fifteen comparisons included all possible pairings of six adjectives: innovative, enthusiastic, caring, stagnant, repressive, and ineffective. Following this, respondents were asked to list what they felt were the major strengths and weaknesses of the college.

SURVEY ADMINISTRATION

A pilot survey was administered to one office group in late January 1986 and was modified based on their comments. The main change was in the section on general impressions. The original survey included ten adjectives in the paired comparisons and required 45 pairs. The group found this to be difficult, boring, and frustrating. Therefore, we eliminated four of the adjectives which seemed to cause the most inconsistency in ratings. Other changes were minor (e.g., including ranges for age and years of service in the first section).

The final survey was given during early March 1986. The staff in student services and financial and administrative services, continuing education, the library, A-V services and development/public information completed the surveys in small groups (their office or department group) with a member of the research staff present to explain the survey and answer questions. In the instructional divisions, surveys were distributed and completed individually. A detailed instruction sheet was included along with the survey.

Surveys were given to all faculty, administrators and classified and hourly staff who worked during the day. The sample did not include the evening custodial staff. Their work shift was during times when the college was closed so they had very limited exposure to the activities being rated.

ANALYSIS OF RESULTS

Ratings of programs, work environment, and promotional activities were subjected to analyses of variance using various groupings of demographic categories as independent variables (e.g., race, sex, age, employment status). Many of these comparisons are not reported because they showed no significant differences. On the ratings of programs, for example, there were virtually no significant differences among groups in their ratings. Generally, employment status (faculty v classified and hourly support staff v administrators) showed the most statistically significant differences.

The survey generated 42 single-spaced typewritten pages of comments. In order to organize these for meaningful discussion, they were grouped according to the section of the survey where they appeared. A panel of two classified staff members, a teaching faculty member and a twelve-month faculty member then reviewed the comments, developed general categories for classifying the comments, and organized them into the categories. A copy of the verbatim comments is available in the Office of Institutional Research for any member of the college staff who wishes to review them.

RESULTS

RATINGS OF COLLEGE PROGRAMS

Ratings given to various instructional and student support services are summarized in Table 1 which provides the mean ratings for support staff (i.e., classified staff, classified supervisors, and hourly staff), faculty (i.e., teaching faculty, counselors, and librarians) and administrators. The ratings could range from one (poor) to five (excellent). Overall, means for different aspects of the credit instructional programs ranged from 3.60 (between average and good) for academic standards in the college transfer program to 4.04 (good) for quality of instruction in developmental studies. For all three instructional programs (college transfer, occupational/technical, and developmental studies), academic standards received the lowest mean ratings. Differences in ratings for faculty, staff, and administrators were generally small and not statistically significant.

Ratings of community service programs ranged from 3.50 for quality of instruction to 3.71 for variety of course offerings and those for counseling services ranged from 3.66 for relevance to students' needs to 3.77 for variety of services. The ratings for the student activities program were considerably lower than those for other programs, ranging from 2.67 (between below average and average) to 2.81 for quality of offerings. Differences among groups were not statistically significant.

Survey respondents also were asked to indicate whether they would recommend TNCC to friends or family. Overall, 122 (54.5%) said they would do so without reservation, 93 (41.5%) said they would, but only for certain programs, and 9 (4.0%) said they would not (Table 2). Faculty and administrators were more likely than classified staff to express reservations in recommending the college (50.0% and 47.4% v 41.1%).

Comparison to Graduate Follow-Up Survey Results

On the annual survey of graduates, students are asked to rate various aspects of the instructional program at TNCC and a number of support services. Although these ratings are obtained in a different context and are not directly comparable, they show considerable similarity to the ratings given by college staff. For example, in the follow-up of 1983-84 graduates, the overall ratings for instruction, counseling, and student activities fall in the same order (instruction first, student activities last) as on the staff survey. The mean rating for quality of instruction was 4.10 for graduates compared to staff ratings ranging from 3.91 to 4.04. Faculty ratings of instruction were even closer, ranging from 4.04 to 4.18. Also of interest is the fact that grading and testing received lower ratings from graduates than did quality of instruction or course content just as academic standards received lower ratings from the staff.

Counseling received an overall mean rating of 3.46 on the graduate follow-up compared to ratings of between 3.66 and 3.77 on the staff perception survey. Student activities, although rated lower than instruction and

counseling, received a substantially higher rating from graduates than from staff (3.37 v between 2.67 and 2.81).

Comments

The analysis of comments on the college's programs reinforced the concerns expressed in the ratings for student activities and academic standards. Scheduling also was cited often as an area needing improvement. A number of comments spoke to a need to improve academic placement, counseling, and advising. Comments on strengths generally mentioned academic programs and faculty.

RATINGS OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

In ratings of promotional activities (Table 3), the on-going activities--radio advertisements, newspaper advertisements, and brochures, flyers, etc.--received lower ratings than the special events. The mean ratings for newspaper advertisements and radio advertisements were slightly below average (2.71 and 2.62) and the ratings for brochures was slightly above average (3.21). Special events all received mean ratings that were above average.

Comments

Comments on promotional activities generally indicated that we were not doing enough advertising or sponsoring enough special activities. Newspaper advertisements and news releases received considerable criticism. The advertisements were generally criticized as being unattractive, boring, and poorly designed. The accuracy of advertisements and news releases was also questioned. The most common concern regarding radio advertisements was the selection of stations used. Publications received considerably fewer comments; several indicated that the quality had improved. The Fall Fun Fest, Christmas Craft Fair, Summer Getaway for Women, and college Open House received favorable comments.

General comments included suggestions that we offer more academic, cultural, athletic, and leisure events to attract people to the campus. Criticisms centered on poor coordination and cooperation in promotional activities, lack of administrative support for activities, and a need for more professionalism in public relations efforts.

RATINGS OF WORK ENVIRONMENT

Ratings of the work environment were obtained on ten-point scales (1-10) anchored at each end by opposing adjectives. Separate ratings were given for department or office and for the college overall. Table 4 gives departmental ratings and Table 5 gives the ratings for the college. The tables show the percentage of respondents choosing the three numbers on the scale closest to each adjective (i.e., 1,2,3 or 8,9,10, depending on which end of the scale the adjective appeared).

On departmental ratings there was a marked preference for one adjective in each pair. The smallest difference was on "conservative-innovative" where 33.0 percent chose the innovative end and 22.0 percent chose conservative. Much of this difference was due to the fact that a majority of administrators rated their departments as innovative. A majority of respondents rated their departments as friendly (74.0%), well organized (60.8%), caring (61.7%), open (55.5%), and informal (54.2%). Differences in ratings between faculty and classified staff were generally small and not statistically different. Administrators gave significantly higher ratings than the others for innovative, creative, open, and caring (the latter difference was significant only for administrators v support staff).

Ratings of the college work environment showed far less consistency than did departmental ratings. There was no adjective which received a majority of high ratings. Friendly received a strong plurality (46.3% v 8.8% for unfriendly) but for every other scale the difference in high ratings for the two adjectives in the pair was less than 15 percent. Ratings of the college work environment were generally far less positive than those given departments. The percentage of high ratings for friendly, exciting, well organized, creative, caring, informal, and open all fell by more than 20 percentage points. Faculty viewed the college work environment as more guarded and unconcerned than did other college staff.

Comments

Most often mentioned among comments on the work environment was a need for improved cooperation, communication, and teamwork within the college. Such comments clearly dominated over other concerns, with 38 references. The next most often mentioned category, with 13 references, dealt with a lack of recognition or support for efforts. In a broad sense, many of these could be viewed as reflecting a lack of communication. Comments critical of the "administration" and lack of leadership were also fairly common (12 and 10 references). Taken together, the comments and the ratings of the college work environment show a high level of concern with the general atmosphere and morale at the college.

OVERALL IMPRESSIONS OF THE COLLEGE

The last part of the survey included a section in which respondents were given a series of forced choice paired comparisons of six adjectives describing TNCC: innovative, enthusiastic, caring, ineffective, stagnant, and repressive. Each of the adjectives was compared with each of the other five (15 total comparisons). Respondents were required to choose which adjective in each pair was more descriptive of TNCC. Table 6 summarizes the results of these comparisons. It shows how often each adjective was chosen and the percentage of the time it was chosen in a pair.

Support staff generally had a more positive impression of the college than did faculty and administrators. They chose "caring", "enthusiastic" and "innovative" more often than any of the negative adjectives. Caring and enthusiastic were chosen more than half of the time they appeared (69.7% and 53.4%, respectively).

Among faculty, "stagnant" was chosen most often (60.9%), followed by "caring" (56.5%), and "ineffective" (53.0%). "Repressive" and "enthusiastic" were both chosen nearly half of the time (49.0% and 48.7% respectively). "Innovative" was chosen less than one-third of the times it appeared (31.9%).

Among administrators, "caring" was chosen most often (73.3%). "Stagnant" also was chosen more than half the time (60.0%), followed by "repressive" (46.7%) and "ineffective" (45.3%).

Major Strengths and Weaknesses

Comments regarding the college's strengths and weaknesses were grouped into six general categories: Promotion, Marketing, and Image; Support Services; Administration, Organization, and Policy; Programs and Services to Students and Community; People (Faculty, Staff, Middle Management); and Attitudes, Atmosphere, Communication, and Morale.

Perceived Strengths

The vast majority of comments about major strengths fell into the categories of Programs and Services (82) and People (65). Many of the comments on programs reflected a commitment to the community college philosophy and mission-- open admissions, community outreach, providing opportunities, quality instruction, and service to the community. A large number of comments spoke in general terms about the quality and dedication of faculty and staff. In addition, many of the twenty-five comments coded into the Attitudes, Atmosphere, Communication, and Morale category specifically mentioned the care and concern shown by faculty and staff.

Twenty-five comments referred to the support services and facilities available at the college. Most often mentioned were counseling, the library, and career planning and placement. Other areas specifically mentioned were developmental studies, financial aid, institutional research, and word processing. Several of the comments referred to the quality of the facilities and equipment.

Most of the nine comments in the Promotion, Marketing, and Image category spoke of positive relations in the community and the success of our graduates. Five comments specifically cited the administration as a strength.

Perceived Weaknesses

The category receiving the most comments (67) as a major weakness of the college was Administration, Organization, and Policy. Most of the comments in this category referred to a general lack of leadership and sensitivity. Some referred to specific offices or questioned the competence of individuals. The area of Attitudes, Atmosphere, Communication and Morale received a large number of comments also (46). The prevailing theme was a lack of communication and cooperation.

In the area of Promotion, Marketing, and Image, the 28 comments included general comments about the college's image, criticisms of a lack of

promotional activities, and criciticisms of the effectiveness and accuracy of information being presented.

Most often cited in the 35 comments regarding Support Services were student activities (11), registration (8), the cafeteria (6), and advising and counseling (5). The bulk of the 34 comments on Programs dealt with concerns for academic standards (10) and class scheduling and cancellation (8). There were ten comments dealing with faculty and staff. Most of these were to the effect that some faculty and/or staff were not dedicated or were not fully competent. Several mentioned a need for more staff development opportunities.

DISCUSSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The results of this survey indicate some ambivalence among the people working at the college. People generally perceive the programs as above average. Nevertheless, a substantial minority have reservations about recommending the college to friends or family. There are programs which they would not recommend. The reasons for these feelings should be explored in more detail to determine whether they reflect false perceptions or biases or a recognition of programs which are, in fact, weak or innappropriate for the college. Interestingly, there were hardly any comments on the survey citing a specific curriculum or discipline as weak.

Student activities was generally perceived as a weak area. Mean ratings of the quality, variety, and relevance of the program were all below average. A survey of students enrolled in Spring quarter of 1986 also found discontent with the program (McLean, 1986). The college's Long-Range Plan (1985) likewise has established development of an expanded student activities program as an objective. Given the potential benefits in student recruitment and retention that can accrue from a strong student activities program (Garland, 1985), it is essential that this area be addressed as expeditiously as possible.

In the area of promotional activities, a great deal of concern was expressed over our newspaper and radio advertisements. Both areas received overall mean ratings that were below average. Written comments indicated concerns for the accuracy, timeliness, and appeal of the information that is disseminated and suggested that more needs to be done. This area also is addressed in the college's Long-Range Plan. A method for assessing the effectiveness of all promotional activities was due in June 1986 and an institutional identity program is to be developed by June 1987. These efforts should receive a high priority.

By far the most serious concern revealed on the survey is that of morale. Ratings of the college work environment, the general impressions of the college, and comments regarding strengths and weaknesses point to a lack of communication and feelings of frustration and distrust. Most people seem to have a good impression of their departmental or office work environment but impressions of the college work environment were considerably less favorable. Ratings were analyzed using a number of demographic factors--sex, race, years employed at the college, etc. Most of these

analyses revealed no consistent or significant patterns. The one exception was in the case of faculty for years of service at the college.

As Table 7 shows, faculty ratings of the college work environment on several critical variables become progressively more negative with increasing years of service at the college. On the caring scale, for example, half of the faculty with five years or fewer at TNCC gave positive ratings. For faculty with more than ten years of service, only 16.3 percent gave positive ratings and 34.7 percent gave negative ratings. On ratings of openness, nearly half (46.9%) of the faculty with more than ten years at TNCC, gave low ratings compared to about one-third (35.0%) for those with five years or fewer. Similar effects obtain on general impressions of the college (Table 8) and willingness to recommend the college (Table 9).

The effect of years of service on faculty ratings of departmental work environment is not as consistent as it was for the more general ratings (Table 10). Those with fewer years at TNCC were more likely to give positive ratings. For all three groups, though, the percentage of positive ratings as considerably higher than the percentage of negative ratings. Also, faculty with more than ten years of experience at TNCC were less likely to give negative ratings than were faculty with six to ten years.

One factor contributing to the negative ratings given by faculty appears to be frustration with the decision-making process at TNCC. Many of the comments on the survey reflect a perception that faculty input is not sought or not heeded. Also, on the college's self-study survey in 1983, over half (58.4%) of the responding faculty indicated that the college-wide committee structure does not provide an effective means of insuring faculty participation in the decision-making process.

The frustration felt by TNCC faculty with college-wide governance is at least somewhat reflective of a national trend. In the Carnegie Survey of Faculty (1985), only 16.7 percent of the faculty at two-year colleges felt that they have a great deal or quite a bit of opportunity to influence policies of their institution (compared to 62.6% who felt they had such influence within their departments), 65.5 percent felt their institution's administration is somewhat or very autocratic (compared to 28.5% for their department's administration), and 39.8 percent felt their department morale was somewhat or much worse than it had been 5 years before (compared to 22.1% who felt it had improved). Despite such reservations about governance, over 90 percent of the respondents also felt that their institution was a very good (46.8%) or fairly good (44.9%) place for them.

The pattern of responses to the Staff Perception Survey and the comments indicate that faculty at TNCC have similarly ambivalent feelings toward the college. Ratings of departmental work environments are generally quite positive except in the areas of innovative, exciting, and creative. The negative ratings for the college work environment appear to center on the issue of governance and administrative style, and the perception of a lack of cooperation among various offices.

Although support staff tended to give more positive ratings than did faculty, many expressed concerns (e.g., 41.1% have reservations about

recommending TNCC) and commented about lack of recognition, involvement, and respect.

The causes of faculty and staff frustration are complex. Solutions to the problem will not be easy. Based on the survey comments, however, it would appear that improved communication is essential. The college's Long-Range Plan charges the Faculty Forum with developing a proposal for collegial governance by July 1987. A procedure for providing input from support staff also should be considered during these deliberations. A number of colleges within the VCCS employ a College Council which includes representatives from faculty, classified staff, and administrators. A similar body at TNCC could prove effective.

Regardless of the means chosen, improving communication is essential to the health of the institution. Events which have occurred since this survey was taken (e.g., reduction in staff, confidence vote) have most likely exacerbated feelings. It will be a serious challenge for all concerned--faculty, support staff, and administration--to set aside personal feelings and begin building the openness and trust which are needed.

References

Carnegie Foundation for the Advancement of Teaching. Carnegie Survey of Faculty. Reported in the Chronicle of Higher Education, December, 1985.

Garland, P.H. Serving More Than Students: A Critical Need for College Student Personnel Services. ASHE-ERIC Higher Education Report No. 7. Washington, D.C.: Association for the Study of Higher Education, 1985.

McLean, C.E. TNCC Student Opinion Survey, Office of Institutional Research, Thomas Nelson Community College, July, 1986.

Norsworthy, J.R., and Zabala, C.A. Worker attitudes, worker behavior, and productivity in the U.S. automobile industry, 1959-1976. Industrial and Labor Relations Review, 38, 1985.

Office of Institutional Research. 1983-84 Graduate Survey, Thomas Nelson Community College, January, 1986.

Office of Institutional Research. Self-Study Survey, Thomas Nelson Community College, 1983.

Table 1

EVALUATION OF PROGRAMS

	Support Staff	Faculty	Administrators	All
College Transfer Program				
Quality of course offerings	3.79	4.00	3.79	3.78
Variety of course offerings	3.63	3.65	3.74	3.65
Relevance to 4-yr. college pgms.	3.63	3.91	4.00	3.77
Quality of instruction	3.80	4.04	4.00	3.91
Academic standards	3.62	3.59	3.63	3.60
Occupational/Technical Programs				
Quality of course offerings	3.91	4.04	3.95	3.97
Variety of course offerings	3.72	3.92	3.68	3.80
Relevance to local job market	3.85	4.04	3.79	3.92
Quality of instruction	3.81	4.12	3.74	3.93
Academic standards	3.67	3.69	3.42	3.65
Developmental Studies Courses				
Quality of course offerings	3.96	4.09	3.94	4.00
Variety of course offerings	3.86	4.13	3.95	3.98
Relevance to credit courses	3.89	3.97	4.05	3.93
Quality of instruction	3.92	4.18	4.05	4.04
Academic standards	3.71	3.82	3.68	3.74
Community Service Programs (Non-Credit)				
Quality of course offerings	3.73	3.53	3.47	3.61
Variety of course offerings	3.63	3.79	3.79	3.71
Relevance to community's needs	3.63	3.60	3.84	3.63
Quality of instruction	3.61	3.36	3.68	3.50
Counseling Services				
Quality of service	3.70	3.69	3.79	3.70
Variety of services	3.71	3.80	4.11	3.77
Relevance to students' needs	3.60	3.69	3.89	3.66
Student Activities Program				
Quality of offerings	2.95	2.82	2.05	2.81
Variety of offerings	2.80	2.70	1.84	2.67
Relevance to students' needs	2.82	2.75	1.89	2.70

Table 2

WILLINGNESS TO RECOMMEND TNCC

	Support Staff		Faculty		Administrators		All*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Would you recommend that your friends or family attend TNCC?								
Yes, without reservation	63	58.9	48	50.0	10	52.6	122	54.5
Yes, but only for certain programs of study	40	37.4	45	46.9	8	42.1	93	41.5
No	4	3.7	3	3.1	1	5.3	9	4.0

*Includes respondents who did not indicate their employment status. Therefore, the totals exceed the sum of the groups.

Table 3

RATINGS OF PROMOTIONAL ACTIVITIES

	Support Staff	Faculty	Administrators	All
Newspaper Advertisements	3.00	2.51	2.21	2.71
Brochures/Flyers, Etc.	3.50	3.08	3.16	3.21
Radio Advertisements	2.76	2.44	2.61	2.62
Special Events				
Summer Getaway for Women (Bee Fair)	4.23	3.50	4.00	3.93
Fall Fun Fest	4.07	3.66	4.26	3.91
Christmas Crafts Fair	3.85	3.54	3.94	3.72
College Transfer Night	3.68	3.38	3.54	3.51

NOTE: These are mean ratings. The ratings were made on 5-point scales: 1.00 = Poor, 2.00 = Below Average, 3.00 = Average, 4.00 = Above Average, 5.00 = Excellent.

Table 4

RATINGS OF DEPARTMENTAL WORK ENVIRONMENTS

	Support Staff %	Faculty %	Administrators %	All %
Friendly	73.8	71.9	89.5	74.0
Unfriendly	7.5	5.2	5.3	6.2
Dull	12.1	12.5	0.0	11.5
Exciting	43.0	40.6	68.4	44.1
Relaxed	44.9	50.0	57.9	48.0
Tense	22.4	16.7	10.5	19.4
Conservative	28.0	20.8	0.0	22.0
Innovative	28.0	34.4	57.9	33.0
Well Organized	57.9	62.5	73.7	60.8
Sloppy	7.5	5.2	10.5	7.0
Creative	43.9	44.8	73.7	47.1
Uncreative	13.1	14.6	0.0	12.8
Unconcerned	11.2	10.4	0.0	10.6
Caring	58.9	62.5	78.9	61.7
Formal	10.3	8.3	10.5	9.3
Informal	47.7	58.3	68.4	54.2
Open	51.4	55.2	84.2	55.5
Guarded	18.7	19.8	0.0	17.2

NOTE: Each pair of adjectives appeared as anchors on a ten-point scale. The first was at the left (1) end of the scale, the second at the right (10). The percentages given represent the percentage in each group who circled the three numbers closest to each adjective (i.e., 1,2,3 for the left anchor or 8,9,10 for the right).

Table 5

RATINGS OF COLLEGE WORK ENVIRONMENT

	Support Staff %	Faculty %	Administrators %	All %
Friendly	43.9	44.8	63.2	46.3
Unfriendly	5.6	13.5	5.3	8.8
Dull	17.8	19.8	15.8	18.1
Exciting	19.6	17.7	26.3	19.8
Relaxed	35.5	24.0	31.6	30.4
Tense	15.9	20.8	31.6	19.4
Conservative	25.2	30.2	36.8	27.8
Innovative	14.0	12.5	26.3	14.5
Well Organized	33.6	24.0	26.3	28.6
Sloppy	10.3	22.9	15.8	16.7
Creative	22.4	15.6	21.1	18.9
Uncreative	15.9	29.2	26.3	22.5
Unconcerned	14.0	31.3	5.3	20.3
Caring	33.6	29.2	42.1	32.6
Formal	15.0	19.8	10.5	16.3
Informal	19.6	26.0	31.6	23.8
Open	29.0	17.7	31.6	24.2
Guarded	26.2	41.7	31.6	32.6

NOTE: Each pair of adjectives appeared as anchors on a ten-point scale. The first was at the left (1) end of the scale, the second at the right (10). The percentages given represent the percentage in each group who circled the three numbers closest to each adjective (i.e., 1,2,3 for the left anchor or 8,9,10 for the right).

Table 6

GENERAL IMPRESSIONS OF TNCC

	Support Staff		Faculty		Administrators		All*	
	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Paired Comparisons								
Innovative	178	46.8	110	31.9	25	33.3	365	39.7
Repressive	161	42.4	169	49.0	35	46.7	414	45.0
Enthusiastic	203	53.4	168	48.7	31	41.3	462	50.2
Caring	265	69.7	195	56.5	55	73.3	601	65.3
Stagnant	175	46.1	210	60.9	45	60.0	487	52.9
Ineffective	158	41.6	183	53.0	34	45.3	431	46.8

*Includes individuals who did not specify their employment category.

NOTE: The percentage column indicates the frequency with which an adjective was chosen when it appeared in a pair.

Table 7

FACULTY RATINGS OF COLLEGE WORK ENVIRONMENT
BY YEARS OF SERVICE AT TNCC

Ratings Scale	YEARS AT TNCC		
	5 or fewer %	6-10 %	More than 10 %
Friendly	65.0	37.0	40.8
Unfriendly	0.0	11.1	20.4
Dull	15.0	18.5	22.4
Exciting	25.0	25.9	10.2
Relaxed	40.0	25.9	16.3
Tense	5.0	18.5	28.6
Conservative	25.0	40.7	26.5
Innovative	15.0	14.8	10.2
Well organized	45.0	25.9	14.3
Sloppy	15.0	22.2	26.5
Creative	30.0	22.2	6.1
Uncreative	15.0	33.3	32.7
Unconcerned	20.0	33.3	34.7
Caring	50.0	37.0	16.3
Formal	15.0	14.8	24.5
Informal	25.0	29.6	24.5
Open	30.0	22.2	10.2
Guarded	35.0	37.0	46.9

NOTE: Each pair of adjectives appeared as anchors on a ten-point scale. The first was at the left (1) end of the scale, the second at the right (10). The percentages given represent the percentage in each group who circled the three numbers closest to each adjective (i.e., 1,2,3 for the left anchor or 8,9,10 for the right).

Table 8

IMPRESSIONS OF TNCC FACULTY BY YEARS OF SERVICE
(Paired Comparisons)

Adjective	YEARS AT TNCC: 5 or fewer N	%	6-10 N	%	More than 10 N	%
Innovative	28	40.0	30	30.0	61	30.5
Repressive	26	37.1	52	52.0	99	49.5
Enthusiastic	37	52.9	49	49.0	93	46.5
Caring	51	72.9	57	57.0	103	51.5
Stagnant	38	54.3	62	62.0	128	64.0
Ineffective	30	42.9	50	50.0	116	58.0

NOTE: The N column represents the total number of times an adjective was chosen. The % column represents the percentage of the time it was chosen when it appeared in a pair.

Table 9

WILLINGNESS OF FACULTY TO RECOMMEND TNCC
BY YEARS OF SERVICE

	YEARS AT TNCC					
	5 or fewer		6-10		More than 10	
	N	%	N	%	N	%
Would you recommend that your family or friends attend TNCC?						
Yes, without reservation	13	65.0	15	55.6	20	40.8
Yes, but only for certain programs of study	7	35.0	12	44.4	26	53.1
No	0	0.0	0	0.0	3	6.1

Table 10

FACULTY RATINGS OF DEPARTMENTAL WORK ENVIRONMENT
BY YEARS OF SERVICE AT TNCC

Ratings Scale	YEARS AT TNCC		
	5 or fewer	6-10	More than 10
Friendly	85.0	59.3	73.5
Unfriendly	0.0	7.4	6.1
Dull	10.0	22.2	8.2
Exciting	55.0	40.7	34.7
Relaxed	55.0	48.1	49.0
Tense	10.0	29.6	12.2
Conservative	15.0	33.3	16.3
Innovative	40.0	33.3	32.7
Well organized	70.0	63.0	59.2
Sloppy	0.0	7.4	6.1
Creative	60.0	40.7	40.8
Uncreative	5.0	22.2	14.3
Unconcerned	10.0	14.8	8.2
Caring	75.0	63.0	57.1
Formal	5.0	11.1	8.2
Informal	65.0	59.3	55.1
Open	60.0	51.9	55.1
Guarded	15.0	22.2	20.4

ERIC Clearinghouse for
Junior Colleges JAN 23 1986